

युष्मदस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोर्विषयविषयिणोस्तमःप्रकाशवद्विरुद्धस्वभावयोरितरेतरभावानुपपत्तौ सिद्धायाम् ,
तद्धर्माणामपि सुतरामितरेतरभावानुपपत्तिः — इत्यतः अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे विषयिणि चिदात्मके युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरस्य
विषयस्य तद्धर्माणां चाध्यासः तद्विपर्ययेण विषयिणस्तद्धर्माणां च विषयेऽध्यासो मिथ्येति भवितुं युक्तम् ।
तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतरतराविवेकेन अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः
मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य ‘अहमिदम्’ ‘ममेदम्’ इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥

From the work named PanchapAdikAprasthAnam by SSS

७. अत्र, “कोऽयं विरोधः? कीदृशो वा इतरेतरभावः अभिप्रेतः? यस्य अनुपपत्तेः—‘तमःप्रकाशवत्’ इति निदर्शनम् ।” -
इत्याशङ्क्य पञ्चपादिकाकार आह -
“यदि तावत् सहानवस्थानलक्षणो विरोधः, ततः प्रकाशभावे तमसो भावानुपपत्तिः, तदसत्; दृश्यते हि मन्दप्रदीपे वेशमनि
अस्पष्टं रूपदर्शनं, इतरत्र च स्पष्टम् । तेन ज्ञायते मन्दप्रदीपे वेशमनि तमसोऽपि ईषदनुवृत्तिरिति ; तथा छायायामपि औष्ण्यं
तारतम्येन उपलभ्यमानं आतपस्यापि तत्र अवस्थानं सूचयति । एतेन शीतोष्णयोरपि युगपदुपलब्धेः सहावस्थानमुक्तं
वेदितव्यम् ।
उच्यते परस्परानात्मतालक्षणो विरोधः, न जातिव्यक्त्योरिव परमार्थतः परस्परसम्भेदः सम्भवतीत्यर्थः ; तेन
इतरेतरभावस्य-इतरेतरसम्भेदात्मकत्वस्य अनुपपत्तिः ।”

//नेदं समीचीनं व्याख्यानम् इत्यस्मिन्मतिः। भाष्याक्षरबहिर्भावात्, लोकानुभवविरोधाच्च। भाष्याक्षरबाह्यत्वं तावत् - इह खलु
सूत्रभाष्ये, अन्यत्र वा न भाष्यकृत् परस्परानात्मतालक्षणं विरोधं तमःप्रकाशयोरन्वाचष्टे। प्रत्युत सहानवस्थानमेवानयोस्तत्र तत्र
निदर्शयति। इह च ‘तमःप्रकाशवत् विरुद्धस्वभावयोः’ इत्येव भाष्याक्षराणि सन्दृश्यन्ते। तानि च प्रकाशस्य तमसा स्वभावविरोधं
वक्तुं प्रभवन्ति, न तु परस्परानात्मताम् इति स्पष्टम्।

ज्योतिश्चरणाधिकरणे च भाष्यकृदाह -

“तमो ज्योतिरिति हीमौ शब्दौ परस्परप्रतिद्वन्द्विविषयौ प्रसिद्धौ । चक्षुर्वृत्तेर्निरोधकं शार्वरादिकं तम उच्यते । तस्या
एवानुग्राहकमादित्यादिकं ज्योतिः ।”

इति। अतः सिद्धमिदं सूत्रभाष्याक्षरबाह्यं व्याख्यानमिति ॥

We need to understand the meaning of the word इतरेतरभावः so as to correctly appreciate the import of statements made by BhAshyakAra ('B') and PanchapAdikakAra ('P'). इतरेतरभावः can mean either इतरस्मिन् सति इतरस्य भावः or इतरस्य इतर भावः। The first meaning is known as सह-अवस्थानम् while the latter is known as तादात्म्य.

The objection by SSS is that the contradiction between darkness and light referred by B is the contradiction of सह-अवस्थानम् and not that of परस्परानात्मतालक्षणो as mentioned by P.

It is trite that whatever import is meant for virodha by B through इतरेतरभावः of yushmat-pratyaya-gochara (YPG) and asmat-pratyaya-gochara (APG), the same should apply for darkness and light. Because darkness and light are used as an example for demonstrating the conflict between YPG and APG. It cannot be that the conflict between YPG and APG is of परस्परानात्मतालक्षणो and that of darkness and light is of सह-अवस्थानम्. Then the example will fail.

So the correct import of the nature of virodha between darkness and light can be ascertained by finding out the nature of conflict between YPG and APG.

If we see the bhAshya statement just subsequent to the impugned statement, it says - तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतरेतराविवेकेन. Meaning thereby - there is आत्मकता of one into another. So, despite the virodha between YPG and APG, there is आत्मकता of one into another. This itself clarifies that the virodha between YPG and APG is that of mutual अनात्मता. That is how the bhAshya will make sense. Despite the virodha of mutual अनात्मता, there is आत्मकता of one into another.

Since B Himself, as demonstrated above, means the mutual अनात्मता as the nature of virodha between YPG and APG, it is pointless to assert that the virodha between darkness and light is not that of परस्परानात्मतालक्षणो but as सह-अवस्थानम्. The point of सह-अवस्थानम् is not at all relevant

here. It might be relevant in some other context, but certainly not here as B Himself shows. P has merely asserted that clearly in case of darkness and light.

It is thus clear that the statement by P is pretty much in accordance with B.

//अन्यत्र तु तमःप्रकाशयोः सहानवस्थानमेव विरोधत्वेनोल्लिख्य निदर्शितम्। तद्यथा -

“न हि विधिशतेनापि तमःप्रकाशयोरेकत्र सद्भावः शक्यते कर्तुम् , किमुत लिङ्गैः केवलैरिति

न च विद्याविद्ये एकस्य पुरुषस्य सह भवतः, विरोधात् — तमःप्रकाशाविव”

एवं छायातपयोरपि विविक्ततामेवाह भाष्यकृत् काठकव्याख्याने -

“छायातपयोरिव अत्यन्तविविक्तं ब्रह्मलोक एवैकस्मिन् ।”

इति। शीतोष्णयोरपि सहावस्थानं न विज्ञायत इति ईशावास्यभाष्ये उक्तम् -

“न हि अग्निरुष्णः प्रकाशश्च इति विज्ञानोत्पत्तौ यस्मिन्नाश्रये तदुत्पन्नम् , तस्मिन्नेवाश्रये शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वा इत्यविद्याया उत्पत्तिः”

तदेवं ‘तमःप्रकाशवत्’ इति निदर्शनभाष्ये सहानवस्थानं तयोर्न विवक्षतमिति टीकावचनं न भाष्यानुगुणमिति स्थितम्।//

Here we need to delve deeply into the nature of darkness. Is it merely abhAva of light or is it some entity in itself which is contradictory to light. If it is abhAva of light, then it is prakAsha-sAmAnyā-abhAva or eka-prakAsha-abhAva or is it sarva-prakAsha-abhAva? It cannot be the first two options because despite the abhAva of deepa-prakAsha, there is no darkness in a place illumined by sunlight (there is prakAsha-sAmAnyā-abhAva and also there is prakAsha-vishesha-abhAva in the form of deepa-prakAsha-abhAva and yet there is no darkness). It cannot be sarva-prakAsha-abhAva either because then to remove darkness, we will need to bring in the confluence of all prakAsha.

Thus, it is proved that darkness is not merely abhAva of light.

This logic is in addition to the view of bhAshyakAra that abhAva is also bhAvAtmaka as shown in BrihadAraNyaka Upanishad 1.2.1. So, proving darkness as abhAva is not going to result in any gain.

Further, such a view is totally in contradiction with its usage in adhyAsa bhAshya where the contradiction of light and darkness is used as an example to show that there cannot be tAdAtmya of one with other and also there cannot be tAdAtmya of one's dharma with another. If darkness is mere absence of light, what would be its dharma? And it would be superfluous to say there cannot be tAdAtmya of x and x's abhAva. It is a tautology and a tautology has no evidentiary value.

B has used light and darkness as two different entities which are mutually contradictory and which have different properties. There cannot be इतरेतरभावः of them, that is, there cannot be tAdAtmya of them. This I discussed in the preceding section as to how it is not सह-अवस्थानम् because that is in no way connected to the context under discussion.

Wherever AchArya has used सह-अवस्थानम् as impossible for light and darkness, it is to be understood that it is the prakhara-prakAsha which cannot coexist with darkness because light and darkness are seen to coexist in case light is not bright such as in the evening.

This is also in consonance with the fact that Brahman (light) and ignorance (darkness) are not contradictory. It is only reflected-Brahman (analogous to prakhara-prakAsha) that is contradictory to ignorance (darkness).

Thus, the objection raised is addressed.

//यदपि टीकायां समाधानग्रन्थे 'परस्परानात्मतालक्षणो विरोधः। न जातिव्यक्त्योरिव परमार्थतः परस्परसम्भेदः सम्भवतीत्यर्थः' इति, तदपि 'शीतोष्णयोर्विरोधो परस्परानात्मतालक्षणः' इत्यंशे यद्यपि सम्यगेव, चिदचितोः परस्परात्मताया

असम्भवप्रदर्शनात्; तथापि ‘जातिव्यक्त्योः परस्परसम्भेद एव तादात्म्यम्’ इत्यंशे नास्त्येव भाष्यानुमतिः। यत्कारणं भाष्ये एवोपलभ्यते इदं वचनम् -

“शुक्लः कम्बलः, रोहिणी धेनुः, नीलमुत्पलम् — इति द्रव्यस्यैव तस्य तस्य तेन तेन विशेषणेन प्रतीयमानत्वात् नैव द्रव्यगुणयोरग्निधूमयोरिव भेदप्रतीतिरस्ति ; तस्माद्द्रव्यात्मकता गुणस्य । एतेन कर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायानां द्रव्यात्मकता व्याख्याता ॥”

इति॥ //

The view taken here by P is following the view of B only. B says in BrahmasUtra as under:-

अपि च कार्यकारणयोर्द्रव्यगुणादीनां चाश्वमहिषवद्भेदबुद्ध्यभावात्तादात्म्यमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । समवायकल्पनायामपि, समवायस्य समवायिभिः सम्बन्धेऽभ्युपगम्यमाने, तस्य तस्यान्योन्यः सम्बन्धः कल्पयितव्य इत्यनवस्थाप्रसङ्गः, अनभ्युपगम्यमाने च विच्छेदप्रसङ्गः ; अथ समवायः स्वयं सम्बन्धरूपत्वादनपेक्ष्यैवापरं सम्बन्धं सम्बध्येत, संयोगोऽपि तर्हि स्वयं सम्बन्धरूपत्वादनपेक्ष्यैव समवायं सम्बध्येत ; तादात्म्यप्रतीतेश्च द्रव्यगुणादीनां समवायकल्पनानर्थक्यम् ।

There is tAdAtmya relationship between dravya and guNa. Through the relationship of tAdAtmya, there is AtmakatA of guNa vis-a-vis dravya. This is precisely what P says which SSS seems to object by citing a passage which should be understood by the quoted Brahma Sutra portion which proves tAdAtmya between guNa and dravya.

Thus, it is proved that P’s view is in consonance with that of B. The AtmakatA of guNa with dravya does not militate against the sambheda of guNa and dravya. The portion quoted by SSS is the refutation by B to the Vaisheshika who posits that guNa and dravya are different padArtha. That is not the view held by P here. He is merely using the existence of tAdAtmya between guNa and dravya (as held by B in तादात्म्यप्रतीतेश्च द्रव्यगुणादीनां) as an example to say that no such tAdAtmya can exist between APG and YPG.

//लोकानुभवविरोधः खल्वपि - यत्र मन्दप्रदीपे वेश्मनि रूपदर्शनम् अस्पष्टम्, तत्र अनुग्राहकस्य प्रकाशस्य पर्याप्तप्रमाणेन अभावादेव स्पष्टदर्शनाभावः, न तु तमसः प्रकाशस्थलेऽपि ईषदनुवृत्तेः - इत्येव जना अवयन्ति॥

As discussed above, the loka-vyavahAra is only for prakhara-prakAsha and not for prakAsha-sAmAnyā or prakAsha-vishesha. In the evening, there is loka-vyavahara - there was little light, there was little darkness also.

//तथा हि; वयोवृद्धाः लिखिताक्षराणि नेत्रदौर्बल्येन स्फुटमवलोकितुम् असमर्थाः सुलोचनमेव सहायीकुर्वन्तो दृश्यन्ते न तु अक्षरावरकं तमोद्रव्यं अपसारयितुम्। यः पुनः 'चक्षुर्वृत्तेर्निरोधकं तमः' इति व्यवहारः, स तु तत्र प्रकाशाभावमेव तमः शब्देन गोचरीकरोतीति सुप्रसिद्धम्।//

How darkness is not prakAsha-abhAva, that we have discussed above. As B also says - darkness obstructs the chakshu-vritti. An abhAva does not have the capacity to obstruct anything. In case of old people who are unable to read clearly, there may be difficulty on account of defects in eyes and also due to darkness. The nature of both difficulties are different. The help is accordingly different. For difficulty due to darkness, light is required. For difficulty due to defective eyes, glasses are required. One should not be confused for another.

// न हि कश्चन विवेकी तमोद्रव्यं प्रकाशव्यापारेण विनाश्यम् अपसारणीयं वेति मन्यते लोके इति।//

If someone does not know the mechanics of perception, his view is irrelevant no matter how much wise he is considered to be in the world. For one who understands the mechanics of perception, there is no other option but to accept darkness as a bhAvarUpa padArtha.

//अतः प्रकाशस्थानीयं चिद्वस्तु, तम इवासदपि सदिव प्रतिभासमानं विषयभूतमनात्माभिख्यम् - इत्येव तयोर्विरुद्ध स्वभावकत्वमिष्यते तमःप्रकाशदृष्टान्तप्रणयनेनेति युक्तमुत्पश्यामः।एवमेव हि सिद्धांतग्रंथे भाष्यकृदपि स्फुटयिष्यति 'सत्यानृते' इति विशेषणोपादानेनेति।//

Asat does not have a swabhAva. What is the swabhAva of horns of hare. Are they sharp? Are they white? Are they soft? Are they long?

Asat is not perceived.

So, chit is prakAsha. Ignorance is darkness. Chit and ignorance are not contradictory in so far as सह-अवस्थानम् is concerned. They are contradictory only in the sense of परस्परानात्मता.

Thus it is shown that the tika by Padmapada Acharya is perfectly in accordance with bhAshya and the objections are refuted.